

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

In the Matter of B.J.S., E.D.S., R.D.S. and J.L.S.,
Minors.

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

JULIA CHATMAN, a/k/a JULIA CHATMAN
ARCHIE, a/k/a JEWELL CHATMAN, a/k/a
JEWELL CHATMAN ARCHIE, f/k/a JULIA
CHATMAN MCCLOUD, f/k/a JULIE
CHATMAN SMITH,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

THEODORE M CLOUD and REGINALD
EUGENE SMITH,

Respondents.

Before: Whitbeck, C.J., and White and Donofrio, JJ.

PER CURIAM.

Respondent Chatman appeals as of right from a circuit court order terminating her parental rights to the minor children pursuant to MCL 712A.19b(3)(c)(i), (g) and (j). We affirm.

The issue as presented is whether petitioner made reasonable efforts to reunite the family before seeking termination of parental rights. The issue is clearly without merit. The evidence showed that the agency established a treatment plan that laid out the requirements for reunification. To assist respondent in meeting those goals, the agency gave respondent referrals for various services including parenting classes, individual therapy, housing assistance, a psychiatric assessment, and an evaluation at the Clinic for Child Study. It also provided a place for family visits to maintain the parent-child relationship.

UNPUBLISHED
May 22, 2003

No. 243520
Wayne Circuit Court
Family Division
LC No. 90-285686

The issue as it appears in respondent's argument is whether the court erred in ordering termination of her parental rights when she demonstrated substantial compliance with the treatment plan. We find no error; respondent failed to obtain suitable housing and failed to engage in individually therapy.

The trial court did not clearly err in finding that at least one statutory ground for termination had been proved by clear and convincing evidence. *In re IEM*, 233 Mich App 438, 450; 592 NW2d 751 (1999). The children came into care due in part to the lack of safe and suitable housing. Despite referrals to various agencies, respondent took no action to secure housing and was living in a motel. Further, the trial court did not clearly err in its determination that the evidence, on the whole record, did not clearly show that termination was clearly not in the children's best interests. MCL 712A.19b(5); *In re Trejo Minors*, 462 Mich 341, 354, 356-357; 612 NW2d 407 (2000). Therefore, the trial court did not clearly err in terminating respondent's parental rights to the children. *Id.* at 356-357.

Affirmed.

/s/ William C. Whitbeck
/s/ Helene N. White
/s/ Pat M. Donofrio